

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Wybro et al.

Serial No.: 10/788,771

Date Filed: 02/27/2004

For: Riser Pipe Support System and Method

Group No.: 3617

Examiner: Swinehart, Edwin L.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Communication of May 3, 2006 and further to the Response to Office Action filed August 15, 2006, applicant respectfully submits this Statement of the Substance of the Interview in accordance with MPEP 713.04.

A telephonic interview was conducted on August 15, 2006 between Examiner Ed Swinehart and Brett Cooke, agent for applicant. Amendments to claims 1, 23 and 36 were proposed by applicant to distinguish over cited prior art, Eie and Peterson, respectively. No exhibit was shown, nor demonstration conducted.

Specifically, with regard to claims 1 and 23, which were rejected as either anticipated by or unpatentable over Eie, the applicant suggested that the limitation of a tubular member operatively coupled to a subsea well appeared to be broadly construed to cover an arrangement where a seabed engaging fundament provides support for tension legs, wells, and risers. Applicant proposed limiting claims 1 and 23 to require the tubular member to be in fluid

communication with the subsea well. The examiner indicated that such proposed amendments would appear to distinguish claims 1 and 23 over Eie, but that further review would be required.

With regard to claim 36, which was rejected as anticipated by Peterson, applicant suggested that the limitation of an aperture being vertically formed through the hull and having a closed vertical periphery was broadly construed to cover the Peterson configuration where the slot is closed by cap 15. Applicant proposed to amend claim 36 is to further require that the aperture have a closed vertical periphery through said hull. The examiner suggested that amending claim 36 to require that the aperture have a closed vertical periphery throughout the extent of the aperture may be appropriate and would appear to distinguish claim 36 over Peterson, subject to further review.

No other pertinent matters were discussed. No final agreement with respect to the claims was reach.

Respectfully submitted,



Brett T. Cooke
Reg. No. 55,836

Andrews & Kurth L.L.P.
600 Travis, Suite 4200
Houston, Texas 77002
713-220-3813 (office)
713-238-7163 (facsimile)
Customer No. 23,444

Date: August 28, 2006